

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8-11 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabe, et al. (US 6,034,710) and Furuya, et al. (US 5,418,097). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an exposure level correction section that corrects the exposure level data output from said exposure level conversion section using a correction factor for each element of a print head, the correction factor being based upon predetermined data stored in the correction table that correlates the exposure level for each element of the print head with an optimal exposure level, and outputting corrected exposure level data.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kawabe and Furuya fail to teach at least this feature of independent claim 1. The Office Action provides Kawabe to teach the use of a print device which includes multiple print levels. Kawabe teaches an apparatus that includes a plurality of recording elements that are independently driven. For each of the recording elements a value of the amount of light necessary is obtained based on the density of the image signal. A correction value is then obtained based on a current reading of light received from the print heads at sensors 55. It is then processed to obtain the calculated corrected data. This data is then stored in a lookup table. The signal data is then corrected based upon the correction data. See column 12, lines 4-55.

Kawabe obtains corrected data based upon light intensity currently provided by the print heads and stored in a lookup table. As confirmed in the Office Action, Kawabe does not provide

an exposure level conversion section and provides exposure level data based on predetermined data stored in a conversion table and an exposure level correction section that corrects the exposure level data based on predetermined data relating to the characteristics of the print head that is stored in a correction table.

The Office Action provides Furuya to provide the teachings absent in Kawabe. Applicants respectfully submit that Furuya also fails to provide the above noted feature. Applicants remarks filed in the Response dated August 31, 2005 with regard to Furuya are hereby incorporated by reference. Applicants submit the following remarks in addition to those incorporated by reference.

Applicants note that Furuya teachings refer to a magnetic roller 12 (drum) printing device. See column 5, line 60 through column 6, line 65. The roller device of Furuya is uniquely different from the claimed apparatus which includes multiple print heads and is also uniquely different from Kawabe which also teaches the use of multiple print heads and not printing based upon a magnetic rolling device. The claims recite correcting exposure level for each print head, thus a correction value is obtained for each print head, not for a single magnetic roller. Thus, Furuya's teachings are not analogous to the claimed features or to Kawabe's teachings.

Further, Furuya teaches detecting overall characteristics of the drum device using predetermined active time factors as they relate to toner density. This is an experimental operation to obtain density control values. This operation is performed using certain conditions such as exposure, development, toner characteristics, process speed, AC and DC component of developing bias voltage. See column 16, lines 62 through column 17, line 10, and column 18,

lines 52-58. The Office Action refers to column 18, lines 52-58 in supporting its arguments. Applicants note that column 18, lines 52-58 merely refer to the above experimental conditions used in column 16, lines 16 through column 17, line 10. Column 18 states that “control of the active time factor may be carried out in combination with control of the DC component of the developing bias voltage, control of the charging potential or control of the exposure amount.” Thus, the control of the active time factor is not used to control the exposure amount as it is for density, but used in combination with other factors which includes the control of the exposure amount to obtain results as shown in table 4 of Furuya. These results relate only to density control and not to the control of exposure level data. Thus, different characteristics are used in combination with the active time factor to determine density control characteristics which are stored in a table.

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Furuya with Kawabe. As stated above, Furuya’s teachings are directed towards a print device utilizing the magnetic roller means of printing, whereas Kawabe teaches use of multiple print heads. One of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the magnetic roller device printing operation to determine the control characteristics of a multiple print head device as taught in Kawabe.

Therefore, in view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kawabe and Furuya fail to teach each and every feature of applicants independent claim 1. These dependent claims 2-3, 5 and 8-11 are also distinguishable for the above reasons as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3, 5 and 8-11 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant